

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Group Art Unit: 2645

Docket No: INTL-0154-US (P6599)

GAU 2645

§ Kelan C. Silvester § Serial No.: 09/189,250 Filed: November 10, 1998 Title: MESSAGE HANDLING SYSTEM

Commissioner for Patents Washington, DC 20231

REPLY TO PAPER NUMBER 2

In response to the office action mailed January 24, 2001, please amend the above referenced patent application as follows:

In The Claims

Please cancel claims 1 through 8, claims 13 through 23, and claim 25.

Remarks

Claim 9 was rejected under Section 102 as being anticipated by Greco. However, there is absolutely no indication that Greco converts voice messages to text. For example, referring to Greco's Figure 2, the textual information associated with the first call 181 clearly was derived (although no indication was provided in the specification) from a caller ID system wherein the telephone number was derived and matched to the owner of the telephone. Notice that the telephone number is listed but rather than providing the name of the actual caller a company name is provided, clearly indicating that caller ID (not speech to text processing) was utilized.

Similarly with respect to item number 188, subject information is provided for this call only. With conventional calls no subject information is provided. The specification does not explain how the text field was created. However, it does indicate that this textual information is only provided in the case where a call is received "from another extension with similar equipment" See column 4, lines 63 through 57. If speech to text conversion were being utilized

Date of Deposit: 2 - 6 - 0/

I hereby certify under 37 CFR 1.8(a) that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail with sufficient postage on the date indicated above and is addressed to the Assistant Commissioner for Patents,

Aéilda Marcel Authement

to derive the subject (which is never explained in the specification), it would be accorded to all voice mail messages not just ones that come from the "same" system.

Thus, it may be reasonably deduced that the cited reference does not teach converting voice mail messages, in full or in part, to text. Therefore, no part of the message itself is converted to text and, therefore, claim 9 distinguishes over the cited reference. For the same reason, the remaining claims in the case likewise distinguish over the art.

In view of these remarks, the application is now in condition for allowance, and the examiner's prompt action in accordance herewith is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Timothy M. Trop/Reg. No. 28,994

Trop, Pruner & Hu, P.C. 8554 Katy Freeway, Ste. 100

Houston, TX 77024

713/468-8880

713/468-8883 [fax]